

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294) and Eastman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,700 B2).

Sparks teaches the structure substantially as claimed including a collapsible child safety seat device for use in a vehicle, the device comprising a seating portion pivotally connected to a back support, the back support comprising a backrest portion and a headrest portion, wherein the seating portion and back support may be folded together, and wherein the headrest portion can be folded to at least partially overlap with the

Art Unit: 3636

backrest portion, whereby the collapsible child safety seat device can be transformed between a deployed position where all the parts are deployed and a compact position where all the parts are collapsed, wherein the seating portion has a top surface and a bottom surface, the back support has a front surface and a back surface, and wherein the seating portion may be folded such that the bottom surface of the seating portion is brought towards the back surface of the back support but does not teach that the seating portion and the back support may be laterally narrowed nor does he teach that the headrest portion can be slidably retracted to at least partially overlap with the backrest portion. However, Czernakowski teaches the concept of laterally narrowing a child seat by having two or parts that can be moved, wherein the device is provided with a deployment mechanism that deploys or collapses one or more of the parts, with respect to each other and between a deployed position and a narrowed position, wherein the deployment mechanism translates motion in one direction to motion in another direction, wherein the motion in one axis is forced directly by a user, wherein the deployment mechanism slidably deploys one or more parts, wherein the deployment mechanism can deploy or collapse some or all of the parts simultaneously, the seat having a restrainer, the restrainer comprising one or more straps, wherein each of the portions comprises at least one continuous rigid member to be old. And Eastman et al teach the concept of a headrest that can be slidably retracted to at least partially overlap with the back rest portion to be old as well [See Figures 1-2 where the head rest is shown at its maximum vertical height (Fig. 2) and in a position where it partially overlaps the backrest (Fig. 1)]. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks, to include the ability to narrow, as taught by Czernakowski, and to include a headrest that can be slidably retracted to at least partially overlap with the back rest portion, as taught by Eastman et al, since such collapsible features would allow the child seat to be used by children of different ages and sizes.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294) and Eastman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,700 B2), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barley et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,466,044).

Sparks in view of Czernakowski and Eastman et al teach the structure substantially as claimed but does not teach the plurality of rigid anchors or latches for anchoring the device to the vehicle. However, Barley et al teaches anchors and/or latches for securing a child seat to a vehicle to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks in view of Czernakowski and Eastman et al, to include anchors and latches for securing the child seat to the vehicle as taught by Barley et al, since such an arrangement would provide a secure attachment of the child seat to the vehicle.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sparks (GB 2 220 848 A) in view of Czernakowski (U.S. Patent No. 5,409,294) and Eastman et

Art Unit: 3636

al (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,700 B2), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burleigh et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,487,588).

Sparks in view of Czernakowski and Eastman et al teach the structure substantially as claimed but does not teach the plurality of rigid anchors or latches for anchoring the device to the vehicle. However, Burleigh et al teaches anchors and/or latches for securing a child seat to a vehicle to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art to modify the child seat, as taught by Sparks in view of Czernakowski and Eastman et al, to include anchors and latches for securing the child seat to the vehicle as taught by Burleigh et al, since such an arrangement would provide a secure attachment of the child seat to the vehicle.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure because it teaches similar concepts of collapsible and laterally collapsible child seats.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney B. White whose telephone number is (571)272-6863. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM-3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dunn David can be reached on (571) 272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rodney B. White/
Primary Examiner,
Art Unit 3636
April 26, 2010